

the so-called COVID-19 relief bill. States are awash with cash that they, frankly, don't know how to spend. The massive \$1.9 trillion bill became law without the support of a single Republican because it was so extravagant and poorly targeted. Case in point: the blue State bailout. This legislation sent 350 billion additional dollars to State and local governments, many of which were not facing any budgetary shortfalls.

We have started to see a flurry of news stories in the past few weeks that have demonstrated exactly why we were opposed to this reckless spending. For example, California has reported a \$75 billion budget surplus—a massive amount of money. Governor Newsom says this will be used to pay down past State debts, send direct checks to Californians, and add to its rainy day fund. In addition to California, you have New York, Colorado, Michigan, Minnesota. Each of these States is expected to have more than a \$1 billion surplus—again, because of the massive shuffling of cash out of Washington, DC, into the States that was not targeted to COVID-19 relief.

This is exactly why we advocated against this tidal wave of funding for States that were not even operating in the red. Taxpayer dollars shouldn't be spent to erase the debts of mismanaged States or to add to their rainy day funds. They have the ability to raise revenue themselves, so it shouldn't be the responsibility of the Federal taxpayers to bail them out or to provide them with this huge cash cushion with their looking to try to find responsible ways to spend it.

Tens of billions of unused dollars from this legislation should be repurposed to help cover the costs of these investments without driving our national debt even higher. It is common sense, and I actually believe that there is a way to incentivize the States to use that additional cash for infrastructure purposes, whether it is through modifications and cost sharing between State and local governments. Many of those States are struggling to find a way, within the guidelines and guardrails that we have provided for COVID-19 relief, to spend it anyway, so why not spend it for infrastructure? Maybe there is a win-win there.

There are a number of ideas now on the table about how to pay for this infrastructure bill, but I hope we can all agree that the massive tax hike that President Biden is proposing is not the answer. This would constitute the largest set of tax hikes in more than half a century, and these increases would do serious damage to our economy just as we are coming out of a pandemic-induced recession.

At a time when our economy is already on fragile footing, the tax burden on Americans would be greater than that of our biggest trading partners and competitors, and this would have far-reaching consequences for our competitiveness and our economy as a whole. After all, we know these tax

hikes won't be reflected in lower earnings for CEOs. The brunt will be borne by consumers, who will pay higher prices, and by workers, who will earn lower wages, and let's not forget those whose jobs have disappeared entirely. We are already seeing some price hikes on some of our most used consumer products, covering everything from cereal, to diapers, to lumber, and to cars.

This is not the time to increase taxes and drive inflation across our economy, which is, actually, a tax increase on low- and middle-income people. We need to find responsible ways to fund an investment in our infrastructure without hurting our economy and the people we represent. Right now, it appears that bipartisan progress is being made toward that just-right-sized policy and for it to be paid for in a responsible way or, at least, that is my optimistic hope.

So I want to thank Senator CAPITO for her leadership on this effort and all those who have been working with our Democratic colleagues and the administration and encourage them to continue to work with folks on our side of the aisle so we can get this done on a timely basis.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer. (Ms. SINEMA).

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

TAXES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, yesterday marked the deadline for filing personal income taxes in America. I am sure many people spent the past weekend surrounded by 1099 forms and shoe boxes full of receipts, hoping to claim a well-deserved tax refund after a year of financial stress due to the pandemic.

That is another reason why the American Rescue Plan that Congress passed earlier this year was such a major accomplishment. It included, that plan, included the largest, single-year tax cut for middle- and low-income earners in the history of the Nation. Let me repeat that. This year's American Rescue Plan included the largest, single-year tax cut for middle- and low-income earners in America's history.

But for a privileged few, those tax cuts are pennies compared to the deductions they enjoy every year because of Republican tax proposals, proposals like the Trump tax plan that Republicans signed into law in 2017, just 4 years ago. Over the next few years, it is

estimated that more than 80 percent of the benefits from this Trump tax plan will go exclusively to the top 1 percent of American earners—the top 1 percent. It is nothing more than welfare for the wealthiest.

Perhaps the most egregious aspect of the Trump tax plan is the billions of taxpayer dollars it will give to the world's wealthiest individuals and corporations over the next decade. We are already feeling the devastating impact this corporate giveaway has had on America's economy.

Listen to this now, if you just turned in your taxes. Last year, 55 of the largest companies in America paid zero—zero dollars in Federal taxes despite making more than \$40 billion in profits. Forty billion dollars in profits; zero taxes. It is a glaring example of the imbalance in our tax system.

I don't think there is any rational explanation for having schoolteachers and janitors pay more in taxes than the largest corporations, but it seems the folks on the other side of the aisle disagree.

When Senator MCCONNELL met with President Biden last week, he said that raising taxes on corporations—the same corporations that paid zero last year in taxes—is a “red line” when it comes to funding the President's infrastructure package. That means Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader in the Senate, would rather cut taxes for the ultrawealthy than repair America's crumbling roads and bridges.

Did you see that picture in the news? Of the bridge? I think it was in Tennessee, on one of the interstates. It cracked so badly, they had to close it, close an interstate bridge. We remember just a few years ago in Minnesota, an interstate highway collapsed, taking American lives. It can happen and will continue to happen unless we do our part. That is not just bad policy; it is dangerous.

I guess this is the picture that I brought to show what was happening with this bridge in Tennessee. You can see the crack in the steel girders there and the reason they closed the bridge. God forbid some other bridge is in that same shape and we haven't discovered it or we won't discover it soon enough.

We need to put some money in our infrastructure. We count on it every day. People rely on the safety of these bridges and other facilities, and it is our job to make sure they are kept up.

That is not just bad policy, saying no tax increases for corporations if it means paying for infrastructure that way; it is dangerous.

Take a look at what happens when we fail to adequately invest in our infrastructure. That photo tells it all. A “structural crack” they called it. That was found in a bridge in Memphis, TN, last week. Tens of thousands of vehicles drive over that bridge every day. It connects commuters and commercial traffic between Arkansas and Tennessee. If not for a scrupulous engineer who caught the crack, local authorities

said it would have led to a “catastrophic” result. Luckily, the catastrophe was averted.

But now the people of Memphis and across America have a different problem. Repairs take time. That means the economic damage caused by the bridge’s closure is going to last for months. And it means that shipping and transportation networks will have to reroute for the foreseeable future. So it has a national impact on the economy, one bridge.

Is this what we have come to in terms of infrastructure in America? Are we supposed to accept bridges hanging by a thread?

This closure happened the same week that cyber criminals shut down one of the largest petroleum pipelines in the United States. Did you see the newscast? Did you see the lines of people and their panicked buying? They didn’t know if there would be enough gas to get to work, to get the kids to school, or in emergencies, so they went and filled their tanks, and we had a real mess on our hands. We saw the chaos that was created by that ransomware attack: cars lining up in every direction; people actually filling—and this is dangerous—plastic bags with gasoline.

While it may have been a bridge in Memphis or a pipeline on the east coast last week, what is next?

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, 43 percent of our public roadways are in poor or mediocre condition. Maybe that just means potholes and banging up your car or slowing down the traffic, but it could be worse.

All of these signs point to the same conclusion: We are living on borrowed funds from a previous generation. We are using the infrastructure that they paid for because we don’t want to create our own infrastructure.

Cutting corners is simply not an option. That is exactly where we are going to end up if Senator McCONNELL’s redline becomes the standard for deciding if we have infrastructure. And it is predicated on a failed economic theory.

The Republican approach—the so-called aptly named Laffer curve—believes if you just cut taxes on the wealthiest people, that will take care of the whole economy. Everybody is going to get well if the wealthiest have more money. I don’t buy it.

It is time to wake up from the trickle-down fever dream. Look at where 50 years of cutting taxes on the extra-wealthy has brought us: bridges on the verge of collapse; pipelines held for ransom; the most unequal economy since the Gilded Age in American history.

The economic consensus is clear: Tax cuts on the wealthy have never created jobs. They have never boosted economic growth. They just boost the banks’ accounts of the people who already have it. The benefits rise all the way to the top of the economic ladder and stay there.

If we want to rebuild America, we need to invest in America. To do that, we need the wealthiest Americans and massive corporations to step up and pay their fair share.

If you think you paid your fair share or more yesterday, how about the corporations that paid zero on \$40 billion of profit?

President Biden understands this. That is why he has proposed the American Jobs Plan. It is going to grow our economy by putting millions of people to work rebuilding roads and bridges, like the Hernando de Soto Bridge. And it would make our crucial infrastructure more resilient to 21st-century threats like ransomware and cyber criminals.

President Biden also has a plan to pay for these investments, unlike the Trump tax plan. To start, the President’s plan would raise hundreds of billions of dollars by holding tax cheats accountable and rolls back the tax breaks that encourage corporations to ship jobs overseas.

This is something that boils my blood. Here is a corporation—and many of them have been located in my State—doing well, making a handsome profit, and expanding their business. They sit down with their counsel, lawyers, and come up with a brandnew idea: Well, let’s just move our headquarters out of the United States, out of the State of Illinois, and put it in some foreign country. Think of how much we will save by not paying our fair share of taxes in the United States. We get all the benefits in this country. We use its infrastructure. We locate here. We actually live here. But we take a post office box in some faraway place and skip paying taxes to America.

What a grand idea that is for some. For me, it is just deception and fraud.

The only people who would see their taxes increase under President Biden’s proposals are those making over \$400,000 a year. Now, if you are making over that amount of money and don’t want to announce it publicly, but you are sick and tired of DURBIN’s speech, get up and leave at this point. But if you are making under \$400,000 a year, stick around because President Biden has made sure these tax increases will not affect you.

Let me put it another way. We can fund President Biden’s infrastructure plan without raising a single tax on actual working families in America. How about that? Frankly, it is about time we balance the scales of our tax system.

During the pandemic, how did the richest 1 percent of Americans do? What was their struggle during this crisis? They saw, the 1 percent, saw their net worth increase by \$4 trillion—not a bad year.

If we want to get serious about creating jobs in America, everybody has to do their part. And this isn’t just about rebuilding our country. It is the next century of global leadership at stake.

S. 1260

Mr. President, this week, the Senate will consider the Endless Frontier Act, a bipartisan measure introduced by Senator SCHUMER, a Democrat, and Senator YOUNG, a Republican. It is primarily focused on investing in America’s leadership in scientific and technological innovation and making sure those investments create jobs—good-paying jobs—in manufacturing and emerging industries. I am sure there are some worthwhile amendments that should be voted on, but I think it is an excellent example of the legislative process at work.

With the Endless Frontier Act, Republicans and Democrats are coming together to recognize that we need to invest in our capacity to compete with China and the rest of the world. This is one of our highest priorities.

While this bill is a promising starting point, remember, it is just a starting point. I hope it is the beginning of a new bipartisan agenda for the future. We can’t afford to stand still. While we might not agree on every solution, I am sure we share the same goal—put America on track to win in the 21st century.

I have listened carefully to many of my Republican colleagues who say President Biden is too ambitious, wants to invest too much money, and has too many big ideas. These Republicans have a solid second-place strategy for America. I don’t want to be part of that.

This country can prosper and lead with the right inspiration. President Biden is bringing that to the table. That is what the American Jobs Plan is all about, President Biden is calling on everybody—everybody—to play a part in building that future.

Let’s invest in America and create millions of good-paying jobs in the process.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise today to oppose the nomination of Kristen Clarke to be the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division.

As I have said multiple times, I am not here to call into question Ms. Clarke’s motives, nor am I here to call into question whether she is a good person. In fact, I am willing to assume and even concede, for purposes of our conversation today, that she is a good person and that her motives are good. It is not my job as a Member of the Senate to go beyond that, but I do have some very serious concerns reflected in

Ms. Clark's record, concerns that, regrettably, she has failed to rebut.

First, given the importance of the Civil Rights Division to the enforcement of our Nation's anti-discrimination laws, I am concerned about past instances in which she has publicly pushed the Department of Justice to not pursue egregious instances of voter intimidation.

Ms. Clarke criticized the Department of Justice's decision to prosecute Ike Brown for voter intimidation and suppression. As a reminder, in that case, the case involving Ike Brown, a Mississippi Democratic official engaged in rampant vote manipulation and absentee ballot fraud.

Rather than praising the Justice Department's successful prosecution of the case, she criticized the decision, stating that some of the claims were "weak." When asked point-blank whether she agreed with DOJ's decision to prosecute two members of the New Black Panther Party who, by the way, showed up to a polling place wielding a billy club, she demurred, saying:

I believe the leadership of the Justice Department had the prerogative to bring the cases that it deemed appropriate to bring.

Well, that is a completely nonresponsive answer. It is a little like saying Congress has the prerogative to pass the legislation that it deems appropriate to pass.

In short, Ms. Clarke was unwilling to deny outrageous voter suppression and intimidation when Democrats were implicated. She showed no corresponding hesitancy in challenging commonsense election security laws, like voter identification requirements, passed by Republican State legislatures.

Indeed, she has frequently challenged State election laws attempting to paint ballot security measures as categorically racially discriminatory, which raises the question: Does Ms. Clarke, in fact, oppose all voter intimidation or just voter intimidation against certain groups? When the position the nominee is applying for involves being the head of the Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice—the very division that is responsible for overseeing voter rights laws—that is not a question that you want to have to ask.

Second, Ms. Clarke has shown a troubling disregard toward certain constitutional rights. A few years ago, she decried the Trump administration's creation of a Religious Liberty Task Force, saying that the goal was "to make it easier for people to use religion to mask their discriminatory goals. Shameful."

I would remind Ms. Clarke that the very first sentence of the Bill of Rights safeguards the very religious freedoms that she accuses of "masking discriminatory goals."

Again, late last year, Ms. Clarke attacked the Supreme Court's decision in *Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo*, saying the Court's ruling wrongly privileged "religious freedom above all else."

Now, by way of reference here, just to set the context straight, that decision in the Supreme Court's ruling in *Roman Catholic Diocese v. Cuomo* simply stated that commonsense proposition—one that is, in my view, unremarkable—that the government must treat mosques and synagogues and churches the same way that it treats liquor stores and acupuncture clinics.

Statements like these give religious Americans like myself pause. Why should we believe that she will defend the civil rights, including the religious rights of all Americans, not just those with whom she happens to agree?

Finally, I am worried about Ms. Clarke's failure adequately to address her troubling history of inflammatory statements and irresponsible activism.

In college, she wrote an article stating that "Melanin endows Blacks with greater mental, physical, and spiritual abilities—something which cannot be measured based on Eurocentric standards."

Not surprisingly, she was asked about this at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing. And when she was asked about it at her hearing, she claimed this statement was meant to be satirical. But at no point—not during the hearing, not in connection with followup questions for the record—did Ms. Clarke ever acknowledge the obvious; that these statements were unacceptable, regardless of whether she intended them to be satirical.

Likewise, rather than express regret for her decision to participate and assist in a conference defending cop killers and domestic terrorists in law school, she merely said that she "provided logistical support." That contradicts the statements made by numerous speakers at the conference who personally thanked her for her efforts.

In preparation for that same conference, Ms. Clarke recommended that an article entitled "Mumia, 'Lynch Law,' and Imperialism" be included in the conference newspaper and discussed in connection with one of the panels.

That article contains some of the most inflammatory anti-police rhetoric I have ever seen. Here is a quote from it, an actual quote: "The Klan is now the Police, with Blue uniforms replacing the sheets and hoods. The corrupt racist Judges, are petty Klan administrators."

When asked about her promotion of this article in her questions for the record before the Judiciary Committee, Ms. Clarke stated that she "ha[d] no independent recollection of that email."

Now, once again, we have here a complete nonanswer. Ms. Clarke declined to explain, much less take responsibility for, associating herself with extraordinarily, obscenely dangerous rhetoric.

Moreover, if Ms. Clarke were to be confirmed, she would be responsible for overseeing pattern and practice investigations of law enforcement agencies,

which makes her unexplained, inexcusable involvement with anti-law enforcement activities all the more troubling.

I would also point out that the article's author, Amiri Baraka, was—like Professor Martin mentioned a moment ago—famously anti-Semitic. On one occasion, he wrote, in reference to Jews, that he had "the extermination blues." So, again, we have Ms. Clarke casually associating herself with a virulently anti-Semitic thinker.

Ms. Clarke also denied on the record that she had served on the editorial staff of a college journal with Amiri Baraka. But a simple Google search of "Kristen Clarke" and "Amiri Baraka" shows that when she was an assistant editor of that journal, Amiri Baraka was a contributing editor. Her denial of this easily verifiable fact is hard to understand.

Now, let's be perfectly clear. I don't bring any of this up to suggest that all of it is unforgivable. Look, everyone has, from time to time, said or done things that they later come to regret, but let's keep in mind what we are looking at here. Ms. Clarke, herself, is asking us to apply a very different standard to her than we have applied to others—a different standard, in many ways, than she has asked be applied to others.

In 2019, her name appeared on a letter sent by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, where she sat on the board of directors of that organization, opposing the nomination of a lawyer named Ryan Bounds, who had been nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. That letter stated that, "[w]hile [Bounds] recently apologized for those comments"—comments that had come up in connection with his confirmation proceedings—"the timing of that apology suggests it is one of convenience rather than remorse, offered in a last-ditch effort to salvage his nomination."

In her hearing testimony, Ms. Clarke provided no explanation for why we should overlook her extraordinarily controversial activities and statements while she was a student. Rather, she attempted to minimize or, in some cases, even evade her actions.

Ms. Clarke's history of irresponsible actions and words didn't end with law school. In 2019, she signed a letter defending Tamika Mallory, a woman who stated that "white Jews" "uphold white supremacy" and associated herself with Louis Farrakhan.

When pressed on this point, she gave no explanation for her statement of support, other than saying that the letter "denounce[d] . . . antisemitism."

Now, I am confused. How can a letter defending a woman accused of making anti-Semitic statements actually be a letter that is denouncing anti-Semitism? Either anti-Semitism is bad or it is not. You can't have your cake and eat it too. The way I read that letter, I don't see the letter as saying, yes,

that statement was bad, but there are other circumstances that should be considered. Instead, I see a whole-hearted defense of the individual herself.

Likewise, just last year, Ms. Clarke wrote an article titled “I Prosecuted Police Killings, Defund the Police—But Be Strategic.”

When pressed about this by my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, Ms. Clarke, once again, sought to evade responsibility, saying that she has “developed a practice of being deferential to editors on title selection.” But I don’t think that is how this works. The article does, in fact, have her name on it. Even if she were deferential, the fact that she is describing herself as deferential here suggests that she did, in fact, make a conscious decision to defer. She didn’t say: I had absolutely no choice in it. I didn’t see the title. She just said that she adopted a practice of being deferential.

In any event, you can hardly blame the editor for the title that he or she chose. Ms. Clarke wrote three times in that piece—three times—“We must invest less in police.”

In short, Ms. Clarke’s record reflects a consistent pattern of inflammatory statements and actions, followed by a disclaimer of responsibility and a lack of candor and remorse. Moreover, her record gives us reason to doubt that she will defend the civil rights of all Americans, not just her political allies.

For these reasons, I regretfully cannot support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, very shortly, we will be voting on the Kristen Clarke nomination to the Department of Justice. This week is an apt time to start the discussion about her nomination because it marks the anniversary of two of the most important Supreme Court decisions in the history of America. The first is the infamous *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision in 1896, wherein the Supreme Court established a standard of separate but equal. That was the standard that was used to justify—legally justify—racial discrimination throughout America. Sixty years later, in the landmark decision of *Brown v. Board of Education*, the Supreme Court unanimously—unanimously—rejected that shameful document and blazed a trail for the modern civil rights movement.

This year, 2021, the Senate has a chance to continue America’s long march toward equality and racial justice by confirming principled, experienced leaders to the Department of Justice. The Senate should work expeditiously to consider and confirm these

nominees. We have already confirmed Attorney General Merrick Garland, Deputy Attorney General Lisa Monaco, and Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta. The next one in the order of the administration’s priority on hiring in the Department of Justice is Kristen Clarke. President Biden has nominated her to lead the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division.

Ms. Clarke is the right person to restore credibility to the Civil Rights Division. Under the previous President, the former Attorneys General Sessions and Barr, that Division was warped into a target and a tool to discriminate against marginalized Americans. During that previous administration, the Division rescinded guidance that strengthened protections for transgender students. They prohibited the use of consent decrees with local police departments that engaged in systemic misconduct. And they abandoned the longstanding principle of defending Americans’ right to vote. Now we have an opportunity for a course correction in the Civil Rights Division by confirming a proven civil rights leader to head that Division.

As a former trial attorney in the Division’s Voting Section and as a prosecutor in its Criminal Section, Ms. Clarke has clearly played in the big leagues. She personally understands the role that the Division’s line attorneys play on a day-to-day basis. Ms. Clarke knows that these career attorneys must be independent from political pressure in order to carry out the mission to defend the civil rights of all Americans, and her diverse background as a legal expert will serve her well.

As the former codirector of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund’s voting rights group, Clarke confronted assaults on voting rights and ballot access, like those we are seeing in State legislatures across America today. As the former chief of the New York Attorney General’s Civil Rights Bureau, she helped establish the Office of Religious Rights Initiative, defending the First Amendment rights of workers throughout the State.

You would find it hard to believe about Ms. Clarke and the issue of freedom of religion, based on some of the earlier statements made on the floor, and to then learn that she established the office’s Religious Rights Initiative in New York. Today, as the president and executive director of the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Ms. Clarke has spearheaded new initiatives to address civil rights issues created by new technologies.

She is singularly qualified to head the Civil Rights Division at this moment. She brings with her a wealth of expertise and experience needed to lead this Division at this moment in history.

She also boasts broad, enthusiastic support from the law enforcement community. If you were on the floor and heard the statement previously made

by the senior Senator from Utah, you would find it hard to believe that law enforcement would support this woman. Some of the things they say about her in criticizing her record suggest that those in the law enforcement community are her natural enemies. The opposite is true.

Throughout her decades of civil rights work—20 years of working in civil rights that included several years as a prosecutor—she has partnered closely with law enforcement. Many of them have publicly endorsed her, and I will get to that in a moment. Yet, if you were to listen to the arguments from the other side of the aisle—and we heard them in committee—you would think this amazing woman must be so gifted that she can engage in the practice of law for 20 years in the same theater, including with law enforcement leaders from all over America, and somehow they never caught on to the fact, according to them, that she was virulently against law enforcement. In fact, they came out and said the opposite. She was fair. She was objective. She was a good partner in trying to resolve difficult issues.

They would have us believe that she has this mystical power to take people in law enforcement and delude them because secretly she is a radical, a Socialist radical. Not true. The partnership she has had with law enforcement began when she prosecuted hate crimes in the Civil Rights Division, and it continues to this day through her work on the Lawyers’ Committee James Byrd Jr. Center to Stop Hate. This center provides community resources, training, and support for law enforcement to better identify, investigate, prosecute, and report hate crimes.

In each of these roles throughout her history as a professional prosecutor at the highest levels in the United States of America, Ms. Clarke has earned the respect and trust of members of law enforcement, reflected in their strong support for her nomination.

Listen to some of the groups that openly support her and then reflect on some of the charges that were just made against her on the floor by the Senator from Utah.

She has support from the Major Cities Police Chiefs Association. She has the support of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives. She has the support of Women in Federal Law Enforcement; the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association; over 40 prominent police chiefs and sheriffs; and Sheriff David Mahoney, who just this month stepped down as president of the National Sheriffs’ Association.

Ms. Clarke’s critics would come to the floor and have you believe she has deluded all of them. She has deceived all of them. Despite the work they have done with her, she secretly can’t stand them.

Well, it is not true. And it is not true, and they know it. I think the Senators on the other side of the aisle should know it as well.

Ms. Clarke has the support of a bipartisan group of former Justice Department officials who wrote to the committee and said: "Ms. Clarke's experience, in addition to her high character, make her a superior choice to lead" the Civil Rights Division. People who worked with her have endorsed her for promotion.

Although Ms. Clarke's record demonstrates that she has devoted her life to advancing the civil rights of all Americans, in recent weeks, she has been the target of an incredible amount of baseless, vitriolic attacks.

I don't understand what is going on around here sometimes when I look at these nominations and wonder how people like her—Kristen Clarke, Vanita Gupta, and others—really enrage people on the other side of the aisle, to the point where organizations are making concerted efforts to really twist and distort their life's work, their values, and the talents that they bring.

Listen to one of these attacks that was just made again on the floor of the Senate. The attack is that she personally defended Mumia Abu-Jamal, who was convicted in 1982 of the murder of a Philadelphia police officer named David Faulkner.

The attack is missing one key point. Ms. Clarke never—never—worked on the Abu-Jamal case. You wouldn't know that from the charges made.

But perhaps the most vicious attack against her is the false accusation of anti-Semitism.

Now, I am not Jewish, and the Senator who suggested that she was anti-Semitic in some of the things that she had said and done is not Jewish either, but those who are of the Jewish faith have considered the charges made against her. Let me tell you what they found.

They found these accusations couldn't be further from the truth. Ms. Clarke has spent much of her career defending the rights of Jewish Americans.

At the New York State attorney general's office, she repeatedly defended Jewish employees' right to observe the Sabbath in the workplace.

Does that sound like someone who is negative on the issue of freedom of religion or anti-Semitic?

She has also been at the forefront of confronting the growth of anti-Semitic hate and harassment online through her work with the Lawyers' Committee. For instance, she helped shut down a virulent White Supremacist and anti-Semitic website called Stormfront.

Several Jewish groups have emphatically denounced the baseless attacks, which continue to be made, even to this day, against this woman.

Notably, the Union for Reform Judaism, the Nation's largest Jewish denomination, wrote to the Judiciary Committee to voice unwavering support for Ms. Clarke's nomination.

Let me tell you what they said. "We've heard the voices who have

hurled accusations of antisemitism at Ms. Clarke, and we reject them. They do not comport with the career and record of the colleague we have worked with throughout her career."

These attempts to smear Ms. Clarke's record are a last-ditch effort to discredit a nominee with exemplary qualifications.

The bottom line is this: Ms. Clarke is the right person to lead the Civil Rights Division. It is a difficult assignment. At any time in our history, it is difficult, probably more so today than ever. She is the person for the job.

At this moment in history, our country needs her combination of expertise, experience, skills, and thoughtfulness to ensure the Civil Rights Division will again work for all Americans.

If she is confirmed to be part of Merrick Garland's team at the Department of Justice, Ms. Clarke would certainly make history, being the first Black woman confirmed by the Senate to lead the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division—the first.

I look forward to supporting her nomination on the floor, as we continue this process, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote to discharge her nomination from committee and ultimately confirm her to this critical position at the Justice Department.

My assignment on the Senate Judiciary Committee is a challenging one. The committee is evenly divided 11 to 11. There are some of the fiercest and strongest partisans from the other side of the aisle as part of this committee structure.

I marvel sometimes at things that are said in the committee. When I look at the evidence—certainly when it comes to Ms. Clarke, her actual life, her career, her experience, and what she has done—it belies some of the baseless criticism that is made.

I just wonder, What is it about this woman that drives some Members into a rage? I have met her. I have heard her questioned in the committee. I believe she has proven throughout her life that she is the right person to move up into this critical position at this moment in history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

LOUISIANA

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I rise today to bring attention to an ongoing situation in South Louisiana.

Heavy rains are hammering our communities. A state of emergency exists across the area, with more rain expected today.

It has been a difficult 2 years, pandemic aside. Eight months ago, Lake Charles was devastated by Hurricanes Delta and Laura, one of the few times in history in which a hurricane followed upon a hurricane, almost identically tracking.

Yesterday, areas got anywhere from 8 to 15 inches of rain in 12 hours. It was heartbreaking to see Lake Charles hit again by natural disaster.

And this is 18 to 15 inches in 12 hours, and there you can see the impact of cars flooded up almost to their window. There is a home in the background, and you can see where the water level is relative to that home.

And here we have another example of vehicles flooded, to give you an idea of how much rain occurred in a short period of time.

Now, other floods and disasters in parts of the country—often floods and disasters in parts of the country, other than the west and the east coasts, get overlooked. I am here to make the case to not overlook. We cannot ignore the pain and destruction left in the wake of these storms.

Overnight, 80 people were rescued from flash flooding in Lake Charles. On top of the rain and submerged roads, there were warnings for possible tornadoes, prompting shelter-in-place precautions.

I heard from constituents that students were kept in schools until late into the night.

Now, it is not just Lake Charles; Baton Rouge flooded as well. In Baton Rouge, more than 250 people were rescued after the city got a deluge of over 13 inches of rain on Monday night.

And this is Baton Rouge—not as bad as Lake Charles in that picture, but even more people had to be rescued.

This morning, at least 15,000 homes and businesses were without power in East Baton Rouge Parish.

The number of homes and businesses flooded in Lake Charles and Baton Rouge combined is not known, but I can promise we will continue to hear distressing and saddening stories about the loss of both life and property throughout South Louisiana in the coming days.

Now, through firsthand accounts, social media posts, and local news coverage, we have already heard emotional stories. In Lake Charles, a resident and their newborn had to swim to safety as water levels rose. In Baton Rouge, a body was found submerged in a vehicle that had gone into a canal.

Water rescues and emergency evacuations have been underway for the last 24 hours, but Americans are at our best when we help those in need, and folks in Louisiana are resilient.

So I give thanks to all the brave men and women of local fire and police departments for their work in saving lives. We will get through this together.

When I was in Lake Charles after the last hurricane, Hurricane Delta, I picked up a bracelet that read "Lake Charles Strong." We are Lake Charles Strong; we are Baton Rouge Strong; we are Louisiana Strong.

While some outside of our State have already forgotten about the natural disasters of 2020, Louisiana has not. Many have yet to return to their homes.

Just 2 weeks ago, President Biden visited Lake Charles, talking about infrastructure in front of the Calcasieu

River Bridge. Well, when I met him, I raised the issue of a disaster relief package.

Our State was hit by hurricanes and winter storms, as well as the pandemic. A record five main storms made land-fall last year in my State. The strongest was Laura, a category 4 hurricane, hitting Lake Charles, followed by Hurricane Delta, a category 2, just a month later.

Louisiana farmers were also hit with catastrophic damage to livestock, crops, and structures during unprecedented winter storms.

We need a disaster supplemental legislation to help communities struggling to recover. We cannot afford to allow the impact of an entire year's worth of natural disasters to go unaddressed.

Our best line of defense for these natural disasters is coastal resiliency, which in our State is funded through what is called GOMESA. That is revenue from offshore oil and gas development.

And folks wonder why I fight so hard to preserve that funding for GOMESA. GOMESA allows Louisiana to rebuild our coastline so if there is a hurricane coming onshore, there is the resiliency from a coastline which is built out with wetlands to absorb the strength of that hurricane.

We need to preserve GOMESA to continue having dollars flow not just to Louisiana but to other Gulf Coast States to protect against natural disasters.

It will be raining today and maybe longer, but to those—oh, one more thing to mention.

There is a portion of the President's—a portion of the President's infrastructure bill which has not attracted a lot of notice but which I would agree with. It is called nature resiliency—using the natural structures of our coastlines in order to increase resiliency against water events and other events.

And in a spirit of bipartisanship, but once seeing the necessity of it, I would support that provision as I now understand it.

So for all those in South Louisiana, please stay safe, listen to local officials for further instructions.

I will continue to monitor the situation and help, as possible, with recovery efforts. My office is in contact with the White House, ensuring the full support of the Federal Government is there to help now and then to help recovery.

Our prayers are with those experiencing flooding and other hardships. We thank the American people for their support.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor this afternoon to talk about the economy, how to get it on the right track and particularly how to deal with the jobs crisis we face right now. It is a different kind of crisis than we normally talk about. There are a lot of jobs open, and the workers who are needed are not coming forward. Washington needs to change direction to get the economy on the right track.

Current law provides that at least until Labor Day—that is in September of this year—there will be a Federal supplemental payment of \$300 per week added to the State unemployment benefit. So if somebody is on unemployment insurance, they will get their normal State benefit, which in Ohio is about half of whatever your income was, but on top of that, now there is a \$300 Federal supplement. It was put in place during COVID-19, but it continues until at least September.

By doing so, adding that \$300, it nearly doubles the unemployment insurance benefit, on average. It also results in about 42 percent of those people who are on unemployment insurance making more on UI than they were making at work. It has the effect of, in most States, more than doubling the amount of unemployment insurance, and it also doubles the minimum wage. So you can imagine why this is a disincentive for some people to go back to work, if they can make more not working.

On top of that, Democrats here in Congress, during the COVID legislation, added another benefit to people on unemployment insurance compared to people who are working, and that is to say that your first \$10,000 of unemployment insurance is tax-free. So if you are a truckdriver making 35,000, 40,000 bucks a year, you don't get that tax benefit, but if you are on unemployment insurance, you do get that benefit—again, another disincentive to go back to work.

People are logical. If the government is going to pay you more not to work than to work, it creates a problem. And you can see that problem. We have a record number of job openings right now; 8.1 million jobs are open in America today.

The economic recovery we all are looking forward to is being hampered by what? A lack of workers. If you go down your Main Street wherever you live, you will see the “help wanted” signs up. If you go by your restaurants, you will see, instead of the marquees saying “Come and check out our great apple pie or our hamburgers,” they say “We are paying signing bonuses”—\$500, \$250. I went by a Frisch's Big Boy on the way to the airport on Monday, and that is what I saw—McDonald's offering a \$500 bonus.

There are manufacturers I know in the State of Ohio I represent offering much more in terms of signing bo-

nuses. I talked to a woman last week, who is a friend of mine, who runs a manufacturing company, a great little company, which has about 200, 250 employees. She is looking for 60 people right now. She is offering a \$1,000 signing bonus plus other incentives, benefits, to be able to come to work, and she can't get people to show up to apply for work. So this is a real problem in terms of our interest in getting this economic recovery going.

It is time to stop this extraordinary Federal unemployment supplement. By keeping in place this \$300 per week on top of this UI benefit and not taxing that benefit, President Biden and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are putting us in a tough position and, I think, on the verge of a real jobs crisis because some of these jobs will end up going away, some permanently, if we don't do something about it.

I believe the Federal unemployment insurance was necessary, the Federal supplement, when we were at the heat of the COVID-19 crisis—let's say a year ago now. People were losing their jobs through no fault of their own. Their businesses were shutting down, in part because the government was putting in place social distancing guidelines or otherwise saying that businesses had to temporarily close. A lot of people lost their jobs.

In my view, Congress rightly put in place expanded unemployment benefits to help those families get by when the economy was largely shut down, but we are in an entirely different place now, entirely different place. Again, 8.1 million jobs are open right now. It is a historic time. We have never had this many jobs open in America.

Thanks to the hard work of a lot of our researchers and scientists, this vaccine has gotten out there at record pace. We now have had vaccinations at levels that we had all hoped for earlier. As a result, with more than half of Americans already having had one vaccination—in my State of Ohio, it is even better than that—restrictions are easing, and businesses are opening up, fully open again. In my home State of Ohio, there is no longer a mask mandate. Here in the U.S. Senate is an example. Things are opening up. With that reopening, again, comes all these job openings that can't be filled.

The economic recovery you would expect right now is not happening because people are not getting back to work.

We just had the jobs numbers from last month. The country added 266,000 jobs in April. This was alarming because it was only one-quarter of what the economists predicted, only 25 percent of what people predicted. It is an early warning sign that should not be ignored.

These disappointing monthly job reports typically tell bad news on two fronts. One is that there haven't been as many new jobs added as you would want, and that is certainly true.

But second, it says there are not enough available jobs out there. There

aren't enough open jobs out there. That is not the problem now. Adequate number of jobs is not the problem. The jobs are available. But if the President and Congress don't change course, that could become a problem. If steps aren't taken to dismantle some of the disincentives to work, some of these record number of available jobs we talked about are going to go away.

Let me give an example. There is a restaurant called Geordie's in Columbus, OH. They have closed down. Geordie's is closed down. They can't find workers. That is the reason. The owner was quoted as saying something like: You know, COVID-19 didn't take me down. He got the PPP loan. He kept going, and he struggled through, and he was staying open. He said: My own government has taken me down, because he can't compete with unemployment insurance at that level.

We have lots of other businesses in Ohio. Here are some. Your Pizza Shop, Muddy's, Donatos—all in Wooster, OH—have told me that they are closing down 1 day a week or more because they are understaffed. Facing no alternative, other businesses are figuring out ways to permanently move forward with fewer employees.

This concerns me. In some cases, they tell me they are just downsizing their business. If you can't find those 60 employees and you are the manufacturer right now, what do you do? You are restricting your business. You are not opening new markets, and you are closing down maybe even some existing customers because you can't serve them. So these jobs are going. Others are figuring out ways to do it with fewer people. Again, some might say that is a good thing—using technology and using automation to displace workers. I don't think it is a good thing. I would rather have more people working. That is what they want, too, but they can't afford it, so they are going to more automation, they tell me, going to anything they can do to do it with fewer workers.

This is a problem, and again, Washington is creating this problem. Why would we do that? Again, I understood it and supported it when we had the COVID-19 crisis. People were losing their jobs through no fault of their own. But the opposite is happening now.

We have to change gears. We are at a crossroads. We can continue to have this economy stagnate, continue to hurt working families, or we can get people back to work and create robust and sustained economic growth.

I would take the \$300 a week, by the way, and shift it to a 6-week temporary bonus of \$100 a week to go to work, a work bonus. You could do that immediately even while keeping the \$300 in place for a short period of time because, right away, you could help people to get back to work. It would happen.

By the way, some States have decided on their own just to get rid of the

\$300 because they know it is not working for the small businesses; it is not working for the economy; it is not working for individuals who are not getting back to their career track, who are losing training and losing the ability to keep up with what is going on at work because they are, again, given this disincentive to go back.

It is working. There was a hotel, I am told, in the first State that decided to do this, which was Montana—did it about 2 weeks ago—a hotel where they were offering every week to hire more employees. They were looking for more employees. They were getting 1 person a week to show up; last week, 60 people—60 people—because they are not offering the \$300 anymore. They are giving the money back.

The Biden administration, as you know, would like to spend a lot more money on a lot of different things—that totals about \$6 trillion when you add it all up—to prime the pump, more stimulus, get the country back to work, as they say.

What has happened is, a lot of this stimulus money, particularly in the \$1.9 trillion COVID package, has overheated the economy—and you can see it in the higher inflation numbers—which is what a lot of people predicted, including Democratic economists and former Secretary of Treasury Larry Summers. A lot of us on the Republican side were concerned about this. Well, it is happening. And we are seeing more and more proposals for more and more stimulus. Inflation is not what we need.

By the way, that spending of \$6 trillion is about six times what the government spent during the New Deal in the 1930s, and that is inflation-adjusted. I mean, this is a lot of money.

Instead, what we ought to do is help get people back to work and encourage them and let this economy grow on its own, which it is going to do. During the COVID-19 discussion, the Congressional Budget Office—a nonpartisan group here in Washington and Congress—told us that the economy is going to recover to its pre-COVID level by mid-year if we do nothing, no more stimulus. Yet people insisted on more and more stimulus, and we can see what is happening.

Part of that stimulus, part of that spending, was this \$300 until Labor Day, \$300 week per week in expanded unemployment benefits from the Federal Government, on top of the fact that you don't get taxed on your first \$10,000. Again, that \$300 is on top of whatever the State benefit is.

Are there other factors that are leading to this labor problem we have now in our country? I think there are. I think there are. One is that we have a situation now where some people just can't afford childcare. So they are not only getting more money on unemployment, perhaps, than they are getting at work; if they go to work, they have to pay for childcare. And childcare is too expensive, and I would like to work on that.

One of the reasons, we are hearing, is that schools are not open, so they have to use childcare because their kids are not in school. With only 54 percent of K-8 schools actually being open today—that is the latest number we have—that is a real problem. Again, that is one we can solve. The CDC is playing a role in that by saying: Get the kids back to school. They can do so safely. There certainly should not be any reason for this now, given the fact that so many people have been vaccinated and, thank goodness, the infection levels are going down so much.

So I know that is an issue. Childcare is an issue.

The other issue, I think, that we have to know is that some people are concerned about still getting infected at work and what the virus might, you know, lead to in terms of an unsafe workplace. But I will tell you, that concern is a lot less now. Again, so many people have been vaccinated, and the CDC again has responded to that and said: You can have a safe workplace. You can have a safe school. It is not hard to do.

So let's get back to work, and particularly, let's deal with this unemployment insurance issue because that is the main reason people are not returning to work, I am told by the employers out there. With more than 40 percent of workers making more with unemployment insurance and that supplement than they would in their jobs, businesses just can't compete.

Think how tragic this is. A small business owner works tirelessly to keep the lights on through COVID-19—again, maybe uses the PPP or otherwise and stays in business—and finally, after more than a year, reaches a point where the virus is in retreat—we are doing all the things we should be doing to make our workplaces safe—and now they might have to close because they just can't find people to work.

The same story is being told all over the country and certainly all over my State. Again, this is why 21 States now, as of this afternoon, including my home State of Ohio, have decided to give the \$300 back. But we shouldn't, here in Washington, continue to provide that \$300 to everybody else.

Governors in these States understand that encouraging workers to return to the job market is essential to the economy, but it is also good for the workforce to get back to work, get back to what happens when you go to work, which is you have that sense of fulfillment, that dignity and self-respect that come with work, and you are keeping up with whatever the technological changes at work are and getting back on your career track.

Guidance from the Biden administration, the CDC, says we can move forward with getting back to normal. It is time for President Biden to follow that advice and to end the disincentive to work that is holding back the economic recovery.

These are simple steps we can take. Again, I would do a \$100 bonus to go

back to work for 6 weeks. But the most important thing is to end the \$300 and to let people once again have the opportunity to pursue their American dream, which is not unemployment; it is getting a job. With 8.1 million jobs being offered—a historic number, the most ever—it is time to make that change.

I urge my colleagues and I urge the administration to change course.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN M. CLARKE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will not be voting to discharge the nominee Kristen Clarke to run the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, so I come to the floor to explain to my colleagues why I feel this way.

While Ms. Clarke may be a very good attorney—in fact, I don't think there is any doubt that she is—she continues the trend of politicized nominees to the Justice Department under this President. While I disagree with her strongly on some of her views, especially when it comes to defunding the police, my issues with Ms. Clarke go beyond that.

The Justice Department and especially the Civil Rights Division need to be committed to impartial and equal justice. In the wrong hands, the Civil Rights Division can be used to target and harass the President's political opponents. It can threaten law enforcement, school choice advocates, religious schools, red States, and profilers.

This isn't a hypothetical. Under Ms. Gupta, the Civil Rights Division defended an effort to take over Louisiana's school choice program. Now, can you imagine that? Luckily, a group of African-American mothers stopped them in the Fifth Circuit. Just think—African Americans stopped an obvious injustice by the Justice Department.

The fact is that our civil rights laws are broad, and the mere threat of their enforcement can chill legitimate political opposition. Because of that, I think that the head of the Civil Rights Division needs to be above reproach when it comes to partisanship.

Unfortunately, Ms. Clarke is a liberal partisan. She has opposed the enforcement of the law against Ike Brown, a Mississippi voter suppressor, either because of the color of his skin or because he was a Democrat. Neither answer is acceptable. She has disparaged religious freedom groups like the Alliance Defending Freedom. She has opposed important Supreme Court decisions protecting religious liberty, individual Supreme Court Justices, and even some of my colleagues. She has held Republican nominees to a standard she didn't want to apply to herself.

Ms. Clarke has run away from her record. I asked her at the hearing whether Mumia Abu-Jamal, the country's most notorious cop killer, was a political prisoner, like someone said at a conference that she helped organize.

She wouldn't answer, telling me she was unfamiliar with the case. Given her youthful activism, I find that very hard to believe. Last summer, she wrote an article in *Newsweek* advocating for defunding the police, but she insists the words on the page aren't what she meant. I am sorry, but if it is not what she meant, then she shouldn't have said it.

I don't think she is the right person for this job at this time. A nominee to lead the Civil Rights Division should be nonpartisan, should be independent, and should be upfront about her beliefs. Unfortunately, I think Ms. Clarke misses all three marks.

As I have said, I don't want to return to the Eric Holder days, so I will vote no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKY). The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Good afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Good afternoon.

Mr. SCHUMER. I am adding a little stability and friendship to these august proceedings, I hope you realize.

VOTE ON MOTION

Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1260) to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the committee-reported substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1502

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment 1502.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1502.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am going to speak on this amendment for a minute, then we will move to the motion to discharge Kristen Clarke.

Mr. President, I have just filed a substitute amendment to the Endless Frontier Act that will pull together bipartisan legislation from across the Senate committees into a single comprehensive bill to restore America's competitive edge.

This new bill will be called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, and it will include bipartisan legislation from the Foreign Relations Committee to strengthen our alliances and hold China accountable for predatory trade practices; bipartisan legislation from the Homeland Security committee to invest in AI, cyber security, and policies to make sure American taxpayer money is used to buy American products; bipartisan legislation from the HELP Committee to protect our research and invest in STEM; bipartisan legislation from the Judiciary Committee to bolster antitrust enforcement; bipartisan legislation from Banking to sanction predatory behavior from the Chinese Communist Party. And, very importantly, the substitute amendment will now include a historic \$52 billion investment to make sure the United States stays on the cutting edge of chip production—semiconductor chip production—which is essential for this country's economy, including our auto industry, our tech industry, and our military.

Again, this legislation will now include a historic and immediate infusion of Federal money in the semiconductor industry to boost domestic production and shore up critical supply chains.

This is a very big deal. It fits in with the concept of the Endless Frontier Act, and I am very pleased it will be in the bill.

American manufacturing has suffered rather dramatically from a chip shortage. We have all heard about auto plants in our States that are closed or operating in reduced capacity because they can't get the chips. The shortage in our tech industry shows how vulnerable our supply chains are.

We simply cannot rely on foreign processors for chips. This amendment will make sure we don't have to.

America invented the semiconductor chip. We are still at the cutting edge of research, but fewer than 12 percent of them are made in America. And if this bill doesn't pass, it will go down to 6. Other countries—notably, China—will become the leaders, not just in chip manufacturing and chip production but in the many industries that depend on chips. We cannot let that happen.

The best way to do that is to add this amendment to the bill, which I have just done, and make sure it passes.

The substitute amendment is dramatic not only in terms of chips but in terms of American investment in research, in science, and innovation. When we invest in research and science and innovation, millions of good-paying jobs follow, and the American economy leads the world. Our failure to invest will displace us from that position and all too soon.